

**Remarks**

I. Introduction

This is in response to the Office Action dated May 1, 2007.

The Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. In response, Applicants amend paragraph [0027] to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. No new matter has been added to the Specification. Support for the amendment is shown at least in original claims 8 and 31.

Claims 1, 6, 16, 18-21, 24, 25, 27-29, 32, 33, 37, 39, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,956,573 (Bergen) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,810,526 (Menard). Claims 2-5, 10-15, 22, 26, 34-36, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,961,954 (Maybury). Claims 9, 30, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0152477 (Goodman). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0013123 (Freeman). Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,805,763 (Lawler). Claims 42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 20005/0076378 (Omoigui). Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and Omoigui and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,289,346 (Milewski).

Applicants traverse the rejections. Claims 7, 8, 31, 46, 47, 48, 49, and 50-51 were canceled in a previously filed Amendment. Claims 1-6, 9-30, and 32-45 remain for consideration.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 6, 16, 18-21, 24, 25, 27-29, 32, 33, 37, 39, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard. Claims 2-5, 10-15, 22, 26, 34-36, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of Maybury. Claims 9, 30, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of Goodman. Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of Freeman. Claim 38 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of Lawler. Claims 42 and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergen in view of Menard and further in view of Omoigui.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not disclose all of the claimed limitations. As a result, Applicants submit that the claims are patentable over the cited references.

Independent claim 1 claims the limitation of:

periodically notifying the user that the customized video presentation is available for access from a remote location

The Office Action states that Bergen is silent on "periodically notifying the user that the customized video presentation is available for access from a remote location" and relies on Menard to cure the deficiencies of Bergen.

Menard describes a system for monitoring broadcast channels, including a device for receiving a plurality of broadcast channels, a central search engine operable to search the received channels for a match with a pre-stored profile, a central memory connected to the search engine for storing the profile, and a plurality of user terminals connected to the search engine over a network.

(Abstract).

Menard, however, does not disclose the claimed limitation of periodically notifying the user that the customized video presentation is available for access from a remote location, as claimed in independent claim 1.

The Office Action states that Menard discloses this limitation at Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 27-57, and col. 5, lines 28-36. Fig. 3 and these related passages of Menard disclose obtaining a user profile search (step 32 of Fig. 3), determining whether the user profile search contains a word that matches a word in a text stream obtained from a video signal (step 33 of Fig. 3, col. 3, line 65 – col. 4, line 53), and notifying the user associated with the current user profile that a match has occurred (step 34 of Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 53 – 57). After the notification, it is determined whether there are additional user profile searches and, if so, the process repeats (step 35 of Fig. 3, col. 4, lines 58 – 62).

As shown in Fig. 3 and the related text of Menard, Menard's operation discloses notifying the user that a word match has occurred. This is very different than periodically notifying the user that a customized video presentation is available for access from a remote location, as claimed in claim 1. Menard does not disclose periodically notifying a user that a customized video presentation is available for access. As a result, claim 1 is allowable over the cited art, either alone or in combination.

Independent claims 21 and 33 claim similar limitations and are allowable for the same reasons as discussed above. As described above, none of the cited references disclose these limitations. Therefore, independent claims 1, 21 and 33 are allowable over the cited art.

Allowance of the independent claims is requested. The remaining claims are dependent upon an allowable independent claim and are therefore also allowable.

III. Conclusion

For the reasons discussed above, all pending claims are allowable over the cited art. Reconsideration and allowance of all claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrew F. Abramson  
Reg. No. 52,538  
Attorney for Applicant  
Tel.: 973-533-1616

Date: July 26, 2007  
**AT&T Corp**  
**Room 2A-207**  
**One AT&T Way**  
**Bedminster, NJ 07921**